



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,164	09/02/2003	Kch-Shin F. Cheng	BOC9-2002-0032 (327)	1554
40987	7590	08/09/2007	EXAMINER	
AKERMAN SENTERFITT P. O. BOX 3188 WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188			NGUYEN, MAIKHANH	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2176		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		08/09/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/662,164	CHENG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Maikhanh Nguyen	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8 and 22-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8 and 22-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the RCE filed 05/22/2007 to the original application filed 09/02/2003.

Claims 1-8 and 22-29 are presented for examination. Claims 1 and 22 have been amended. Claims 9-21 and 30-43 have been cancelled. Claims 1 and 22 are independent claims.

Request Continuation for Examination

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05/22/2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-8 and 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Fukuzaki** (US Patent No. 5948103, issued 09/07/1999) in view of **Ginteret al.** (US Pat. No. 7143290, filed 07/2001).

As to claims 1 and 22:

Fukuzaki teaches a method and a machine readable storage for storing electronic documents (*see Abstract*) comprising:

- associating at least one electronic document and a digital seal using an associated object, (*col.2, lines 29-60 ; col. 7, lines 16-54; col. 12, lines 8-16; and col.17, lines 38-42*), wherein the digital seal uniquely corresponds to an image of a seal that is visually displayable within a user interface; displaying the image within the

- user interface (e.g., a seal image is displayed on the screen when the position pointing device which comes in a shape of a seal stamp, having the encoded data of the document reflected in a slightly blurred seal image; col. 5, lines 10-16);
- moving the displayed image within the user interface as the associative object is associated with the at least one electronic document so as to visually simulate the image being affixed to the at least one electronic document (e.g., FIG. 6 is that the seal image data affixing seal segment 131 in the affixed electronic seal processing device 101 can receive a modified seal image data from the seal image data modification means 121 and also be able to place the seal image data at a specific location in the document data D001 (a location the affixing person wants to place) upon receiving the information for the affixing position from the position detecting segment; 141; col. 15, lines 56-57 & the position detecting segment 141 in the affixed electronic seal processing device 102 detects which position on the tablet the electronic seal stamp 301 is pointing, and delivers the coordinate data as the position for affixing the seal to the seal image data affixing segment 131 ... This verification process can be done by bringing the specific electronic seal stamp 301 used for affixing the seal to near the verification process device 202 for the affixed electronic seal; col. 17, lines 26-59);

- when the displayed image is moved adjacent to or over another image within the user interface representative of the at least one electronic document (*col. 12, lines 26-36; col. 13, lines 7-52; and col. 14, lines 33-42*);
- storing at least one metadata attribute as a characteristic related to the associated object (*col. 7, lines 29- 62; col. 19, lines 38-48; and col. 20, lines 8-64*); and
- modifying a logical storage location characteristic of the at least one electronic document based on one of the metadata attributes (*e.g., a predetermined characteristic is extracted from the encoded electronic document. The symbolic figure is then modified in accordance with the characteristic. The confidential key and the symbolic figure may be stored in a portable media; see Abstract, col.7, lines 29-62, and col.20, lines 8-19*).

Fukuzaki does not specifically teach “generating an audio signal to audibly simulate the image being affixed to the at least one electronic document”.

Ginteret teaches generating an audio signal to audibly simulate the image being affixed to the at least one electronic document (*e.g., outer portion 4204 is used for encoding digital information. FIG. 107A shows an example "template" seal before this ...Any kind of information (e.g., numerical, text, graphics, sound, or any combination of these) may be encoded into the image of seal 4200... encode digital information into the seal's image*;

col. 28, lines 13-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Fukuzaki with Ginteret because it would have provided the capability for enabling a person's eyes to make the judgment on the authenticity of the document to a certain degree, and makes it possible to conduct a precise verification by modifying the seal or the signature with characteristic data of the document.

As to claims 2 and 23:

Fukuzaki teaches a digital seal (*e.g., an electronic seal stamp; col. 5, lines 32-33 and 37-38*).

As to claims 3 and 24:

Fukuzaki teaches presenting at least one multimedia object within the user interface, wherein the multimedia object is a user selectable representation for the associative object (*e.g., audio, multimedia; col. 2, lines 51-54*).

As to claims 4 and 25:

Fukuzaki teaches requiring an authorization code previously specified within one of the metadata attributes before allowing the at least one electronic document to be retrieved (*see Abstract; col. 1, lines 38-42; col. 5, lines 14-16*).

As to claims 5 and 26:

Fukuzaki teaches the authorization code is valid for a first user and wherein the authorization code is invalid for a second user (*col. 23, lines 3-60; and col. 44, line 35-col.45, line 2*).

As to claims 6 and 27:

Fukuzaki teaches associating a second associative object with one of the at least one electronic document (*col. 2, lines 29-67*).

As to claims 7 and 28:

Ginteret teaches the associative object includes an authorization code, and wherein the second associative object includes a second authorization code, the method further comprising the step of: requiring the first authorization code and the second authorization code before the one of at least one electronic document can be retrieved (*col.7, line 58-col.8, line 19; col.10, line 52-62; col.22, line 61-col.23, line 21; and col.48, lines16-44*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Fukuzaki with Ginteret because it would have provided the capability for enabling a person's eyes to make the judgment on the authenticity of the document to a certain degree, and makes it possible to conduct a precise verification by modifying the seal or the signature with characteristic data of the document.

As to claims 8 and 29:

Ginteret teaches establishing a first authorization code for the associative object, wherein the first authorization code is associated with a first image; encoding the at least one associated electronic documents with a second authorization code associated with a second image; and, decoding the at least one associated electronic documents using at least in part the first image (*col.7, line 58-col.8, line 19; col.10, line 52-62; col.22, line 61-col.23, line 21; and col.48, lines 16-44*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Fukuzaki with Ginteret because it would have provided the capability for enabling a person's eyes to make the judgment on the authenticity of the document to a certain degree, and makes it possible to conduct a precise verification by modifying the seal or the signature with characteristic data of the document.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicants' arguments filed 05/22/2007 have been considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that *Milsted does not teach the generation of a sound to audibly simulate an event* [Remarks, page 10].

In response, the newly applied prior art (*Ginteret et al.*) is used to teach the claimed limitations as explained above.

Applicant further argues that *Fukuzaki* does not teach modifying a logical storage location characteristic of an associated electronic document based in a metadata attribute of the associated object [Remarks, page 11].

In response, *Fukuzaki*'s teaching “*a predetermined characteristic is extracted from the encoded electronic document. The symbolic figure is then modified in accordance with the characteristic. The confidential key and the symbolic figure may be stored in a portable media*” (see Abstract, col.7, lines 29-62, and col.20, lines 8-19) reads-on the claimed “*teach modifying a logical storage location characteristic of an associated electronic document based in a metadata attribute of the associated object.*”

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record, listed on PTO 892 provided to Applicant is considered to have relevancy to the claimed invention. Applicant should review each identified reference carefully before responding to this office action to properly advance the case in light of the prior art.

Contact information

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached at (571) 272-4137.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

MN

William S. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER